Islamic Morality in the Modern World

Introduction

This document analyzes how Islamic morality adapts to the modern world.

It argues that the core principles of Islamic morality are compatible with the modern world and that Muslim positions on moral issues must be interpreted to promote these core principles.

This is because the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* originate from the 7th century, which is technologically, economically, and demographically different from the modern world. These different circumstances make it impossible to follow the core principles of Islamic morality without interpretation on specific moral issues to fit modern circumstances.

Many Muslims believe that their positions on moral issues comes from following every word in the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth*. They do not follow every word in the Islamic sources. They interpret these sources inconsistently, ignoring how the Islamic sources require analysis.

The rest of this document will examine the following:

1. Core Principles of Islamic Morality
2. Historical Circumstances and Islamic Morality
3. Debates over the Evolution of Islamic Morality
4. Impacts of Debates over the Evolution of Islamic Morality
5. Conclusions on the Evolution of Islamic Morality
6. Contradictions in the Refusal to Adapt Islamic Morality
7. Examples of Interpretation of Islamic Sources
8. Islamic Morality and Modern Issues
9. Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Strict Arguments
10. Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Authoritarian and Divine Arguments
11. Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Contradictions in Strict Arguments
12. Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Lenient Arguments
13. Modern Circumstances Favour Lenient Interpretations

Core Principles of Islamic Morality

The core principles of Islamic morality are articulated in the *Qur'ān*.

The *Qur'ān* commands Muslims to persevere through hardship and live righteous lives.

See verses 3:190–200 (*ʾĀli ʿImrān*).

It commands Muslims to stand for justice and oppose hatred.

See verses 4:135 (*an-Nisāʾ*), 5:8 (*al-Māʾidah*), and 7:28–30 (*al-ʾAʿrāf*).

It commands Muslims to promote peace.

See verses 60:6–8 (*al-Mumtaḥanah*), 5:32 (*al-Māʾidah*), and *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 56, *Ḥadīth* 8.

It commands Muslims to promote equality.

See verses 3:195 (*ʾĀli ʿImrān*), and 33:35 (*al-ʾAḥzāb*).

It commands Muslims to promote charity.

See verses 2:196 (*al-Baqarah*), and 2:261–264 (*al-Baqarah*).

It commands Muslims to promote accountability.

See verses 6:160–164 (*al-ʾAnʿām*).

Most Muslims would agree that perseverance, justice, peace, equality, charity, and accountability are part of the core principles of Islamic morality.

These core principles are compatible with the modern world. This is demonstrated when compared to religious groups that isolate themselves from the modern world.

For example, the people of the Christian Amish church often live in isolated communities without many modern technologies like cars, electricity, modern clothes, and other tools.

This is based on their core principles of reliance on God and detachment from this world.

See the books of Matthew 6:19–24, 1 Timothy 6:5–13, and Romans 12:2.

The *Qur'ān* does not command detachment from this world through things like monasticism.

See verse 57:27 (*al-Ḥadīd*).

Thus, Islamic morality is compatible with the modern world and Muslims must not isolate themselves from modern society in the same way groups like the Amish do. Islamic morality is centered around perseverance, justice, peace, equality, charity, and accountability.

Historical Circumstances and Islamic Morality

While the core principles of Islamic morality are compatible with the modern world, Muslim positions on specific moral issues change with historical circumstances.

An example of this is Muslim positions on slavery.

Some *Qur'ānic* verses permit marriage and sexual relations with *mā malakat aymānukum* (those whom your right hands possess). This refers to slaves.

See verses 4:24–25 (*an-Nisāʾ*), 23:5–6 (*al-Muʾminūn*), and 33:50 (*al-ʾAḥzāb*).

Also see Freamon, *Possessed by the Right Hand*, p. 1.

There are also *Ḥadīth* on *ʿAzl* (coitus interruptus). These *Ḥadīth* describe coitus interruptus with wives, female slaves, and women from the *Banū Mustaliq* tribe when they were captured in war. The majority of these *Ḥadīth* permit coitus interruptus.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 16, *Ḥadīth* 146–163, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 64, *Ḥadīth* 182.

Also see Freamon, *Possessed by the Right Hand*, p. 140–143, and Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, p. 39–40, 47–52.

This is better than Judaeo-Christian positions on slavery. The Bible explicitly increases slavery and allows masters to treat their slaves unjustly.

See the books of Exodus 21:20-21, Ephesians 6:5–8, 1 Timothy 6:1–2, 1 Peter 2:18–21, and Colossians 3:22–24.

The *Qur'ānic* verses, the *Ḥadīth*, and the historical accounts of the *Banū Mustaliq* tribe show that Muslims had higher standards for treating slaves than other societies and permitted paths to emancipation.

However, these *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* still assume slavery and permit sexual relations with slaves and captives without marriage. This complicates the abolition of slavery in Islamic morality.

Debates over the Evolution of Islamic Morality

As the abolition of slavery spread across the world in the 19th and 20th centuries, Muslims made strict and lenient arguments on abolition.

The strict argument is that Islam forbids the abolition of slavery. Abolition defied the *Qur'ānic* verses making it unlawful to prohibit something which was made lawful in Islam.

See verses 5:2 (*al-Māʾidah)*, 5:87 (*al-Māʾidah)*, 7:32 (*al-ʾAʿrāf)*, 16:116 (*an-Naḥl)*, 66:1 (*at-Taḥrīm)*.

Also see Freamon, *Possessed by the Right Hand*, p. 319–320, 322–325.

The lenient argument is that abolition fits with the core principles of justice, peace, equality, and accountability in Islamic morality, and that the *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* on slavery are bound by historical, economic, and demographic circumstances.

The industrial revolution, the invention of machines, population growth, and the transfer of people from villages to cities facilitated abolition. The work of slaves, especially farmwork and cyclical manual labour, could now be replaced by machines. The work in factories and offices would be taken up by free people moving into cities.

See Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, p. 51–54.

Additionally, the Islamic sources are better than the Bible on slavery, so the Islamic sources must have intended to remove slavery once the historical, economic, and demographic circumstances were removed.

This is like the *Qur'ānic* verses that gradually prohibit alcohol. Those verses first discouraged alcohol, then prohibited it before prayer, and then prohibited it entirely.

See verses 2:219 (*al-Baqarah*), 4:43 (*an-Nisāʾ*), and 5:90–91 (*al-Māʾidah*).

The verses discouraging alcohol were bound by the historical and cultural circumstances of Arab culture. Once drinking culture was removed from Arab society, the latter verses could prohibit alcohol entirely.

Likewise, the *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* improving the conditions of slaves were bound by the historical, economic, and demographic circumstances of Arab society, so once those circumstances were removed, slavery could be prohibited entirely.

Impacts of Debates over the Evolution of Islamic Morality

The strict arguments against abolition increase violence, abuses of power, and sexual assault in the Middle East.

In the Gulf states, employers can commit abuses of power and sexual assault against immigrant workers from South Asia and Southeast Asia. These labour conditions resemble slavery.

See Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, p. 41–43.

Improvements to the lives of these workers are hindered by the legal systems of the Gulf states. Muslim justifications for slavery are relevant here.

See Katie McQue, "'Every Day I Cry': 50 Women Talk About Life as a Domestic Worker under the Gulf's Kafala System."

Also see Pete Pattisson, "Saudi Arabia Accused of Using Forced Labour ahead of Fifa World Cup Decision."

Modern slavery is present in other parts of the world but is most prevalent in the Gulf states. This means that Muslim justifications are not the source of modern slavery in the Gulf states but increases it.

Other factors include economic and Western ideologies that reduce workers rights and increase their debt (i.e.: racial capitalism, neoliberalism).

See International Labour Organization, "Global Estimates of Modern Slavery Forced Labour and Forced Marriage," p. 2–5, 18, 20, 24, 62, 65.

There are also terrorist groups that openly enslave non-Muslims. They justify this using the *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* mentioning slavery.

See Kenneth Roth, "Slavery: The ISIS Rules."

Conclusions on the Evolution of Islamic Morality

Most Muslims accept abolition, and so have a lenient position towards abolition.

Few support the arguments presented by those who oppose abolition.

Few support abuses of power and sexual assault against immigrant workers in the Gulf states.

Few support the terrorist groups who openly enslave non-Muslims.

This means that most Muslims accept that Islamic morality is adaptable to historical circumstances.

Abolition was not explicitly promoted in the *Qur'ān* or *Ḥadīth*. It is still accepted because it is implied by the core principles of justice, peace, equality, and accountability in Islamic morality.

The *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* that assume slavery and forbid abolition were interpreted to be bound by historical, economic, and demographic circumstances.

Contradictions in the Refusal to Adapt Islamic Morality

Some Muslims refuse to talk about slavery in Islam because they do not want to commit *Bidʿa*.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 29, *Ḥadīth* 10, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 30, *Ḥadīth* 23–24.

They argue that Muslims must strictly follow every word from the *Qurʾān* and *Ḥadīth* without interpretation. They believe that any human interpretation introduces heretical *Bidʿa* into the Islamic sources. So, they refuse to interpret the *Qurʾānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* that discuss slavery.

They do not realize that the Islamic sources require interpretation to deal with contradictions.

For example, some of the *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* state that The Prophet of Islam stayed in Mecca for thirteen years after receiving the revelation, and then lived in Madinah for ten years until his death at sixty-three.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 63, *Ḥadīth* 127–128, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 64, *Ḥadīth* 481, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 43, *Ḥadīth* 149–151, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 43, *Ḥadīth* 154–157.

Some state that The Prophet of Islam stayed in Mecca for ten years and Madinah for ten years.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 64, *Ḥadīth* 480, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 66, *Ḥadīth* 1, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 61, *Ḥadīth* 56–57, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 77, *Ḥadīth* 117, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 43, *Ḥadīth* 147–148.

Some state that he stayed in Mecca for fifteen years and died at sixty-five.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 43, *Ḥadīth* 158–162.

Two acknowledge conflicting reports among the *Ṣaḥāba*.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 43, *Ḥadīth* 152–153.

The Prophet of Islam received his first revelation around 610 CE, began publicly preaching to the people of Mecca in 613 CE, migrated from Mecca to Madinah in 622 CE (the *Hijra/Hijrah*), and died in 632 CE.

See Watt, *Muhammad: Prophet and Statesman*, p. 22, 36, 66, 83–84, 90–91. 227–228.

So, the *Ḥādīth* describing how he lived in Mecca for thirteen years and then in Madinah for ten years are correct.

The ones giving ten years for Mecca might have assumed he got his revelation around the same time he began publicly preaching in 613 CE.

The ones that give fifteen years or said that he died at sixty-five however seem to be an error in narration or an error in memory.

These *Ḥādīth* demonstrate that one cannot strictly follow every word from the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* without interpretation. Even if one presumes the *Ḥādīth* are authentic, one must find all the relevant *Ḥādīth* and conduct research and analysis to interpret which ones take priority.

Examples of Interpretation of Islamic Sources

Here are some examples where research and analysis are needed to interpret the Islamic sources to avoid contradiction.

For example, some *Ḥadīth* discuss the *Zinā l-ʿAynayni n-Naẓar* (The *Zinā* of the eyes through the lustful gaze).

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 46, *Ḥadīth* 32–33.

These *Ḥadīth* likely use extreme language to encourage one to lower their gaze but likely do not require a person to be punished for committing *Zinā* based on their gaze.

This reasonable analysis is interpretation. So too would applying the punishments for *Zinā* based on people's gazes be an interpretation. So too would assuming that those *Ḥadīth* are beyond human comprehension be an interpretation. When considering the full context of these *Ḥadīth*, the extreme language interpretation seems the most reasonable.

Some *Ḥadīth* discuss how *Mā ʾasfala mina l-kaʿbayni mina l-ʾizāri fa-fī al-nār* (Whatever is below the ankles of the lower garment is in the Fire).

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 77, *Ḥadīth* 5–9, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 46, *Ḥadīth* 32–33, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 37, *Ḥadīth* 68–76.

One of these *Ḥadīth* only states that the lower garment hanging below the ankles is in the fire. The majority state that it is in the fire when it is done out of pride and arrogance. The full context shows that one must be careful to avoid pride and arrogance in behavior. The length of one's lower garments is not the focus.

This reasonable analysis is interpretation. So too would relying on the *Ḥadīth* only mentioning the lower garment be an interpretation. So too would assuming that those *Ḥadīth* are beyond human comprehension be an interpretation. When considering the full context of these *Ḥadīth*, the reasonable priority is pride, with the length of one's lower garment being a secondary priority.

Some terrorist groups justify their indiscriminate fighting and killing of non-Muslims with certain verses from the *Qur'ān*.

See verses 8:55–61 (*al-ʾAnfāl*), 9:5 (*at-Tawbah*).

They ignore the context of these verses and ignore the verses promoting peace. They have interpreted these verses, and most Muslims reject their strict interpretation of these verses because they apply it unreasonably.

Some verses describe the *Yadu l-Lahi* (The Hand of Allah).

See verses 48:10 (*al-Fatḥ*), 3:73 (*ʾĀli ʿImrān*), 5:64 (*al-Māʾidah*), and 67:1 (*al-Mulk*).

One might interpret these verses as metaphors that do not anthropomorphize *Allāh*.

One might instead believe that humans lack the knowledge to interpret these verses, and so treat those verses like the *Muqaṭṭaʿāt* (Mysterious Letters) in the *Qurʾān*.

See the table on the *Muqaṭṭaʿāt* from Wikipedia.

However, comparing *Yadu l-Lahi* to the *Muqaṭṭaʿāt* is also an interpretation. When considering the full context of these verses, the metaphorical interpretation seems the most reasonable. *Allāh* must be capable of making metaphors since it is something humans can also do.

Islamic Morality and Modern Issues

Muslims make strict and lenient arguments on modern issues.

The strict arguments are that Muslims must strictly follow every word from the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* without interpretation.

The lenient arguments are that Muslims must interpret the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* according to the core principles of Islamic morality while paying attention to historical, economic, and demographic circumstances.

The strict arguments contradict the lenient position most Muslims have towards abolition.

The strict arguments that refuse to interpret the Islamic sources contradict themselves in the same way those who refuse to talk about slavery in Islam contradict themselves.

Additionally, the strict arguments increase violence and familial dysfunction and destroys one's health. This contradicts the core principles of Islamic morality like perseverance, justice, peace, equality, charity, and accountability.

Thus, Muslims should not support these strict arguments, just as they should not support the abuses of power and sexual assault against immigrant workers in the Gulf states or the terrorist groups that openly enslave and indiscriminately kill non-Muslims.

Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Strict Arguments

I will first describe the strict arguments made by Muslims on various modern issues.

I will use three examples of modern issues: gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders.

The strict argument towards gender equality is that men and women are spiritually equal in Islam, but that men have authority over women in marriage and worldly affairs, including a right to assault them.

See verses 4:34 (*an-Nisāʾ*), and 4:176 (*an-Nisāʾ*).

The strict argument towards sexual morality is that the *Qurʾān* prescribes strict sexual laws with harsh punishments for disobedience of those laws.

See verses 4:15–16 (*an-Nisāʾ*), and 24:2 (*an-Nūr*).

Additionally, these sexual laws include prohibitions against the attraction to the same gender.

See verse 7:80–81 (*al-ʾAʿrāf*).

The strict argument towards the separation of genders is that the *Qurʾān* and *Ḥadīth* prescribes a strict separation of genders and that the disobedience of this separation is a serious offense.

This includes *Ḥadīth* which mandate specific appearances for specific genders (like beards for men).

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 2, *Ḥadīth* 64–72.

This includes *Ḥadīth* which curse those who imitate other genders.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 77, *Ḥadīth* 102–104, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 64, *Ḥadīth* 354, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 67, *Ḥadīth* 168.

This includes *Ḥadīth* which forbids one from imitating non-Muslims (for whom there might be an overlapping of genders).

See *Sunan Abū Dāwūd*, Book 34, *Ḥadīth* 12.

This includes *Qurʾānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* which forbid one from altering the body (which is possible for those with a natural inclination towards other genders).

See verses 30:30, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 77, *Ḥadīth* 146–149, 159–162.

Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Authoritarian and Divine Arguments

There is a strict argument towards gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders that are based on parental authority.

The argument is that the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* commands people to obey their parents, which requires them to follow their parent's positions on moral issues. Since most Muslim parents have strict positions on gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders, their children must follow those positions.

See verses 17:23–24, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 78, *Ḥadīth* 2, 6–8, and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Book 1, *Ḥadīth* 165–170.

There is also a strict argument towards sexual morality and the separation of genders that rely on divine authority.

The argument is that people suppress and destroy their sexuality to attain *Jannāt* (Heaven), including the natural attraction to the same gender and the natural inclination towards other genders.

These attraction and inclinations are considered the *Nafs* (Soul, Base desires) and so must be suppressed and destroyed. The suppression and destruction of the *Nafs* is considered the primary form of *Jihād* (Struggle, War).

Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Contradictions in Strict Arguments

There are contradictions in the strict arguments, the strict authoritarian arguments, and the strict divine arguments towards the modern issues of gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders.

The strict argument on gender equality increases violence in marriages and familial dysfunction. The strict arguments on gender equality also treat men as partners to *Allāh*. This is because women rely on men for personal and moral matters, while men only rely on *Allāh* for such matters. This difference in authority is like relying on the *Jinn* (Spirits) for personal and moral matters, which is close to *shirk* (associating partners with God).

See Chaudhry, *Domestic Violence and the Islamic Tradition*, p. 2–12.

The strict arguments on sexual morality and the separation of genders destroys one's health. Attempts to destroy the natural attraction to the same gender and the natural inclination towards other genders increases distress, depression, substance abuse, and attempted suicide.

See Forsythe, "Humanistic and Economic Burden of Conversion Therapy Among LGBTQ Youths in the United States."

Demanding the destruction of one's health contradicts the core principles of Islamic morality like perseverance, justice, peace, equality, and accountability, as well as the verses stating that no soul is charged beyond its capacity.

See verses 2:286 (*al-Baqarah*), 7:42 (*al-ʾAʿrāf*), and 23:62 (*al-Muʾminūn*).

The strict authoritarian argument commanding people to obey their parents on gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders contradict the verses cursing those who kill their children.

See verse 6:140 (*al-ʾAnʿām*).

The strict divine argument demanding people to suppress and destroy their sexuality to attain *Jannāt* contradict the descriptions of the *Nafs*. The *Nafs* are described in the *Qurʾān* as the *Nafsa la-ammāratun bil-sū* (The soul that enjoins evil), the *Nafsi l-lawāma* (The soul that blames itself), and the *Nafsu l-muṭ'ma-ina* (The soul that is at peace).

See verses 12:53 (*Yūsuf*), 75:2 (*al-Qiyamah*), and 89:27 (*al-Fajr*).

Muslims must control their *Nafs* so that their souls go from enjoining evil to enjoining peace. Attempts to destroy the natural attraction to the same gender and the natural inclination towards other genders increases distress, depression, substance abuse, and attempted suicide.

This is not peace. This is evil. The destruction of the natural attraction to the same gender or the natural inclination towards other genders does not direct the soul from *Nafsa la-ammāratun bil-sū* to *Nafsu l-muṭ'ma-ina*. It does the opposite.

So, the suppression and destruction of all sexuality cannot be *Jihād*. Only the suppression and destruction of certain types of sexuality, such as sexual abuses of power and sexual assault, are a form of *Jihād*. This is because the souls that commit abuse or assault enjoin evil and are not at peace, while the souls that are at peace avoid abuse and assault.

Islamic Morality and Modern Issues: Lenient Arguments

Since the strict arguments increase violence and familial dysfunction and destroys one's health, the lenient arguments must be favored for the modern issues of gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders.

It is for the same reasons why most Muslims favour the lenient positions on the issues of abolition and the killing of non-Muslims.

The lenient arguments on all these modern issues are that certain verses are bound by historical, economic, and demographic circumstances, and so must be interpreted according to the core principles of Islamic morality and their improvements over the Biblical laws.

The lenient argument on gender equality is that men and women are spiritually and temporally equal. The verses stating men's authority over women are bound by historical and economic circumstances of the 7th century.

Those verses are better than the Christian position.

See Ephesians 5:22–24, Proverbs 13:24, 1 Corinthians 11:3.

But they were also meant for a historical circumstance in which men were the only providers of wealth for a family and women were the primary caretakers of a family. Men are no longer the sole providers of wealth and women are no longer the sole caretakers of a family, so neither should have authority over the other. See Chaudhry, *Domestic Violence and the Islamic Tradition*, p. 13–20, 187–190.

The lenient argument on sexual morality is that sexual laws function to punish sexual abuses of power and sexual assault. The verses against forms of sexuality that does not involve sexual abuses of power or sexual assault are bound by historical, economic, and demographic circumstances of the 7th century.

The harsh punishments for sexual disobedience and attraction to the same gender are better than the Christian position.

See Leviticus 18:22, and 1 Corinthians 6:9–10.

But they were also meant for a historical circumstance in which marriages were economic tools to tie large families together and increase the size of the small Muslim population, which was also important for rural farm work before the advent of modern medicine.

Marriages are now understood as sources of love and economic security combining two working people's incomes in one household. The Muslim population is also very large, most live in cities, and medicine has significantly decreased the rate of infant mortality.

All these factors mean that punishments for sexual disobedience and prohibitions against the natural attraction to the same gender are likely bound by historical circumstances to some extent.

The punishments should focus on cases of sexual abuses of power and sexual assault, which cannot be justified using the *Ḥadīth* describing coitus interruptus with slaves and women who were captured in war. Those *Ḥadīth* are also bound by historical circumstances.

The lenient argument on the separation of genders is that the Islamic sources does not demand a strict separation of genders.

The *Qur'ān* does not demand a strict separation of genders for those who are intersex.

See verse 42:49–50.

Additionally, the *Ḥadīth* which curse those who imitate other genders lack the full context. The *Ḥadīth* with the full context show that it is not the act of being inclined towards other genders that was a problem for the Prophet, but rather how one treats the privacy of others.

See *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 77, *Ḥadīth* 104, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 64, *Ḥadīth* 354, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*, Book 67, *Ḥadīth* 168.

These verses and *Ḥadīth* are better than the Biblical precedence.

See Deuteronomy 22:5.

These *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* also suggest that there was never an intended prohibition against the inclination towards other genders in the Islamic sources.

Modern Circumstances Favour Lenient Interpretations

After examining the strict and lenient arguments towards abolition, the killing of non-Muslims, gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders, the lenient arguments demonstrate a better adherence to the core principles of Islamic morality.

All the strict arguments claim that Muslims must strictly follow every word from the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* without interpretation.

All the lenient arguments claim that it is impossible to follow every word from the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* without interpretation. Attempts to follow without interpretation only lead to contradictions and unreasonable interpretations.

Instead, Muslims must interpret the *Qur'ān* and *Ḥadīth* with attention to their full context through research and analysis. They must pay attention to the core principles of Islamic morality as well as the historical, economic, and demographic circumstances.

The strict arguments increase violence, abuses of power, sexual assault, familial dysfunction, and the destruction of health.

The strict arguments against abolition increase abuses of power and sexual assault against immigrant workers in the Gulf states.

The strict arguments towards slavery and the killing of non-Muslims are used to justify the violence and enslavement committed by terrorist groups.

The strict arguments against gender equality increases violence in marriages, familial dysfunction, and treat men as partners to *Allāh*.

The strict arguments against sexual leniency when there is no sexual abuse of power or sexual assault destroys one's health. This contradicts core principles of Islamic morality, contradicts several *Qur'ān* verses, and does not lead to peace, only evil.

The strict arguments prohibiting the natural inclination towards other genders destroys one's health. This contradicts core principles of Islamic morality, contradicts several *Qur'ānic* verses, and does not lead to peace, only evil.

The lenient arguments argue that the *Qur'ānic* verses and *Ḥadīth* on slavery, gender equality, sexual morality, and the separation of genders, are all improvements over Christian positions. This implies that the Islamic sources must have intended further improvements on these moral positions once the historical, economic, and demographic circumstances changed.

Thus, these verses intend to promote abolition, gender equality in all aspects of life, sexual leniency, and leniency towards those who are inclined towards other genders.

Doing so is also consistent with the core principles of Islamic morality like perseverance, justice, peace, equality, charity, and accountability.